REMARKS

As set forth in paragraphs 3-9 of the Office Action dated January 10, 2006, all of the claims continue to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Kishi et al. in view of Recker et al. when taken alone and/or in combination with a number of additional references.

Applicant amends base claims 1 and 17 to more particularly point out applicants invention and distinguish it from the references of record. Specifically, the claims have been amended to more particularly point out that the invention is directed to the bonding of prepregs to the faces present on honeycomb walls wherein the prepreg resin forms fillets during bonding to the honeycomb faces and wherein said fillets have an A dimension in the direction extending paralell to the prepreg bonding surface and a B dimension in the direction extending perpindicular to the prepreg bonding surface along the honeycomb wall. The claims further point out that the fillet forming particles dissolve during curing to form fillets wherein said A dimension is approximately equal to said B dimension. Support for the preceding amendments to the claims is found in paragraph 26 of the specification.

Applicant's invention, as now claimed, is not obvious in view of Kishi et al. in combination with Recker et al. According to Kishi et al., the conventional practice is to use a structural adhesive to bond the prepreg to the honeycomb core. In order to reduce weight and cost, it is desireable to use a prepreg where the resin of the prepreg migrates into the honeycomb to provide the required bonding. However, it has been very difficult to achieve high bonding strength with such self-adhesive prepregs (Kishi et al., page 2, lines 26-32). Kishi et al. also points out that fillet shape affects the bond between the prepreg and core, but provides no suggestions regarding specific desired fillet shapes (page 2, lines 30-38). Nowhere does Kishi et al. suggest that the structural adhesives which are used conventionally to bond prepreg to honeycomb can also be used as the matrix resin in a self-adhesive prepreg.

Recker et al. is directed to resins that may be used as matrix resins for prepregs or as structural adhesives (page 2, lines 3-5). Recker et al. and Kishi et al. may be in the

same general field of endeavor (i.e. resins and prepregs), however, there is no reasonable expectation that the resins of Recker et al. could be used to form a self-adhesive prepreg where the resin migrates into the honeycomb to provide the necessary bonding described by Kishi et al. Recker et al teaches that its resins can be used as either a prepreg resin or a structural adhesive. There is no teaching that the Recker et al. resins are capable of providing the combined features which are necessary for use as a self- adhesive prepreg resin of the type contemplated by Kishi et al.

One of ordinary skill would view the combination of Kishi et al. and Recker et al. as a suggestion that the resin of Recker et al. be used as a structural adhesive to bond a separate prepreg to honeycomb in the conventional manner described by Kishi et al. There is no teaching, suggestion or expectation that the resins of Recker et al. can be used to provide a self-adhesive prepreg as required by Kishi et al. and applicant.

The amendments to the claims are intended to more particularly point out the unique nature of self-adhesive prepregs to distinguish the invention from Recker et al. The amendments also focus on the unique fillet formation provided by applicant's invention wherein the prepreg resin cures to form fillet having approximately equal dimension. Neither Kishi et al. nor Recker et al. teach this claimed feature.

In paragraphs 4 – 8 of the Office Action, a number of different claims have been rejected based on Kishi et al. and Recker et al., when taken in view of additional references, such as Hayes, Ghali et al., Portelli et al., Maranci et al. and Japan '619. All of these additional references must be combined with Kishi et al. and Recker et al. in order to support the rejections. Applicant submits that these rejections should also be withdrawn, since they depend on Kishi et al. and Recker et al. as the basis for obviousness.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request that this application be reexamined and allowed.

Applicant encloses herewith complete English translations of JP-A-9-132636 and JP-9-143249. These two references where cited in the Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement dated December 22, 2005. Partial translations of these two

references where submitted with the Supplemental IDS. The enclosed complete translations were recently obtained by applicant.

A request for a 1-month extension of time is enclosed to extend the due date for this response to May 10, 2006.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 082060.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 03, 2006

/David J. Oldenkamp/
David J. Oldenkamp, Reg.# 29,421

HEXCEL CORPORATION
11711 Dublin Boulevard
Dublin, CA 94568
(925) 551-4900 x 4394 (Telephone)
(925) 828-3213 (Facsimile)